Thesis:

Without evidence a claim is relatively weak and has nothing to fall back on. This is true for most areas of knowledge, however not for all. Like most questions of knowledge we have to evaluate each area of knowledge on its own, as there are severe differences between them.

1. Natural Sciences
   1. Maths
      1. Pythagoras theorem is inevitably, indefinitely true.
         * 1. Some might argue that we can’t indefinitely prove ts validity in the future, as the future is unknown, still we have enough evidence to back up our claim that it will work
           2. Is a Area of knowledge with many rules and laws that have evidence backing them up. One can’t simply make up a rule in mathematics without proof and claim its validity; it is untrue until you can prove it works.
2. Human Sciences
   1. Economics
      1. Supply and demand theory, commonly accepted as being true, however not indefinitely true.
         * 1. Supply and demand theory states that demand and supply are determined by price and that they will adjust to the price level. Meaning the demand for a bottle of coke will be higher at 50euro cents per bottle than at 80euro cents per bottle. This is commonly accepted as being truthful and although there is evidence against the theory that human nature might chance, or is not the same everywhere in the world, there are exceptions to the theory that make it incorrect to some extent. There is still a substantial amount of evidence in of the theory. Consequently it is accepted world wide as correct and can therefore not be dismissed.
           2. Is an area of knowledge that deals with the human nature which is unpredictable. Claims have to be individually assessed and debated over for their validity. If I were to make a claim within economics it would be neither true not false until I was disproven or proven, it would be a theory.
           3. Contrary to maths(Natural schience) which needs direct evidence to be truthful and can be dismissed without valid evidence, the human sciences can be accepted as truthful without indefinite evidence for or against the claim.
3. Religion
   1. Supernatural beings
      1. The existence of God/Gods cannot be proven nor disproven. As it is a personal topic however it is morally wrong to dismiss the claim. Vise versa it is morally wrong to force someone to accept the claim of the existence of a God/Gods.
      2. Value: Very important to religion, without it God can be dismissed as there is no substantial proof that can be displayed. As values however play a role and religion is seen as a private and personal matter religion can neither be proven or disproven. Inevitably I could start a religion that believes in a flying pizza bread, it would be morally wrong to condemn my religion or to be insensitive towards my opinion.
      3. Personally everyone can decide for themselves what they believe in and what they dismiss, still it is morally wrong to impose your beliefs on someone else
4. Evaluating claims
   1. Ways of knowing: how do we assess claims?
      1. Reason: We can use reason to evaluate claims. It is reasonable that Pythagoras theorem will work if I try it now, in a weeks time, in a year and so far. Indefinitely it is proven as being correct. It is also reasonable to accept that Demand and Supply theory will work for the time being, the way society functions right now can quite accurately be described by the theory. Still it is reasonable to accept that not every human being does and will act according to the theory. Purely using reason we could dismiss the existence of God, there is no logical proof for the existence of supernatural beings. Values and morally however make us judge religion using not only reason but also using values and morals. Religion is a question of faith. There needs to be no evidence for an individual to believe in something, that is what faith is. ->emotion, faith is influenced by our emotions. Consequently emotions help us judge claims.
5. Conclusion
   1. Christopher Hitchens would argue "That which can be asserted without evidence can be dismissed without evidence." To my understanding however, this is incorrect. It depends on the claim that is made without evidence. Certain principles apply to the different areas of knowledge and our different ways of knowing determine how we judge these.